DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 177 SP 024 049

AUTHOR Barr, Robert D.
TITLE School of Education Mergers: Institutional Survival or Administrative Madness?
PUB DATE Jan 84
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *College Administration; College Planning; Declining Enrollment; Higher Education; Institutional Autonomy; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; *Mergers; Program Budgeting; School Closing; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *OSU WOSC School of Education

ABSTRACT

Confronted with declining enrollment and budget reductions, schools of education have increasingly considered institutional merger as a possible approach to survival. This solution is currently being worked out in large education systems in Maine and Indiana. During the decade since the merger of two large institutions in Indiana, both problems and advantages have been reported. Among the problems, loss of identity and autonomy for one campus, increased administrative bureaucracy, and a strain on the governance of both schools have been cited. However, opportunities for students have been widened, resources have been shared across the two sites, and there has been a lessened dependency upon part-time faculty. A case study of the merger of the Schools of Education at Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College provides insights into the difficulties and advantages of institutional mergers. It is pointed out that mergers most often fail because of human issues rather than financial or legal problems. Nevertheless, in the few settings where significant programmatic and administrative mergers have been attempted in higher education, there is considerable evidence that they have led to greater institutional security, improved programs, and expanded opportunities for students. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249177

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION MERGERS:

INSTITUTIONAL SURVIVAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE MADNESS?

By

Robert D. Barr, Dean
OSU-WOSC School of Education

January 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert D. Barr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 024 049

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION MERGERS:

INSTITUTIONAL SURVIVAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE MADNESS?

When confronted with the problems of declining enrollment and dramatic budget reductions that have become all too typical in the academic arena in recent years, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education came up with a very novel approach to address the situation. Reflecting an unusual spirit of pioneering innovation, the Board launched an experiment in inter-institutional administrative merger designed to create a single School of Education from two of the state's oldest institutions, Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College. While mergers have become the standard of the day in the world of business and industry and ever more frequent in public education as part of local school consolidation, mergers in higher education are almost non-existent. Certainly, there have been "mergers", or cooperative agreements, between all-male and all-female schools in the East, between all-black and all-white schools in the South, and between financially troubled private colleges, but significant programmatic mergers in higher education have rarely been considered. To attempt mergers between institutions involving rabid alumni groups; almost hallowed traditions involving everything from football, to fraternities, to faculty governance; and possibly involving institutions with hundred-year histories has apparently been viewed, at least until recently, as foolhardy at best. At its worst, some have suggested that it many well reflect administrative madness. But the citizens of the State of Oregon have long been proud of their pioneering instincts, so perhaps it was appropriate that in August 1982 merger came to higher education in the great Northwest.

A MERGED SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

The Oregon Board of Higher Education's decision to merge two education programs resulted in the creation of a new inter-institutional organization: the OSU-WOSC School of Education.* With this merger, the State Board instantaneously created the largest School of Education in both the state and the region, with the largest selection of graduate and undergraduate programs available in the area. The merged School included close to 140 faculty members, over 3,000 undergraduate students, and more than 600 graduate students. The combined budget of the new School was over $4 million plus an additional $3½ million generated from external sources.

The merged School, located on two campuses 20 miles apart, offers students a choice between two distinct campus atmospheres while assuring them a single high quality set of programs. Western Oregon State College is the oldest Liberal Arts College in the State of Oregon and is located in Monmouth, Oregon, with a small-town population of 6,000. WOSC has a total student body of approximately 2,500 and has been nationally recognized for its teacher education program, especially in elementary education and secondary education. In fact, until 1978, WOSC was named the Oregon College of Education. Oregon State University, with an enrollment of 16,000, is the oldest state institution of higher education in the state. OSU is one of only a dozen Land Grant and Sea Grant universities in the nation and enjoys a strong tradition in both doctoral study in education and in teacher education--especially in the fields of vocational education, science and math education, and elementary education. OSU, part of the Pac 10 Athletic Conference, is located in Corvallis, Oregon, with a population of 42,000.

* The merger also involved a third party negotiated agreement with the state's major research and development center. the Teaching Research Division.

The merger brought together an interesting combination of components that seemed not only to fit together, but often to complement one another. One campus was small and rural, the other more metropolitan. One institution was a small college, the other a complex university. WOSC had never had doctoral programs, OSU had a complete range of programs through the Ed.D. and Ph.D. WOSC had a Special Education Department, OSU had never had a Special Education Department. OSU had the state's only graduate programs in Vocational Education. The faculty size of the two education programs was almost exactly the same (OSU 70.28 FTE; WOSC 66.67 FTE). The budgets likewise were almost identical on the two campuses. WOSC had more undergraduate students than OSU; OSU had more graduate students than WOSC. Average salaries for the various academic ranks were not significantly different.

The merged School of Education was organized administratively with a single Dean and three Assistant Deans with responsibility and authority across both campuses (each of the four chief administrators have scheduled time and offices on both campuses). The merged School was organized around a single set of eleven Departments, with the Chairs of these Departments having responsibilities across programs and faculty on both campuses. All Department meetings and School-wide faculty meetings are "joint" meetings involving faculty from across both campuses. And, while the merger was initially focused on administration, the emphasis soon expanded to programs. All programs were made available to students on either campus, and systems were developed so that students could enroll one time, pay a single tuition, but take courses on either or both campuses. The merger provided for single entrance requirements, single administration procedures, a single set of programs, a single registration process, and even a single "Joint Degree". The amalgamation of these separate programs and procedures into a "single" format, proved to be a complex, time-consuming process.

The differences between the two education programs created a number of unusually difficult dilemmas. The most critical was the fact that the faculty at WOSC was organized into a collective bargaining unit, the OSU faculty was not organized. Another situation proved awkward, at least initially: both programs had a Dean of Education and only one could be maintained. The new Dean of the merged School would have two budgets from two different institutions and report administratively to two different Presidents. The merger of the School of Education would in fact come to touch and sometimes radically transform every concept of institutional life on both campuses. Policies and procedures for everything from health services, to libraries, to parking, to athletics, to registration and fee collection, had to be reviewed, revised, and sometimes reinvented. In August 1982, when the State Board created, with the stroke of the pen and a roll call vote, a new merged School of Education, few probably realized they were utilizing the most unique and certainly the most ambitious response available to the problems of declining enrollment and budget reduction that were confronting higher education throughout the nation.

A TIME OF TROUBLE FOR
SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Teacher education takes place in America in 1,340 higher education institutions nationally--in more than 70 percent of all institutions of higher education. The size and scope of the programs at these institutions grew in size and complexity during the 1960's, as efforts were made to train the massive numbers of teachers needed to help the nation's schools grapple with the post-World War II baby boom. And, just as the "baby boom" children created "instant" shortages of teachers and facilities as they entered the nation's kindergartens and first grades, the graduation of this generation from high school led to problems for public schools and universities. No community in America has avoided local school closures and "reductions in force" of local teachers. As the teaching job market disappeared, so too did enrollments in schools and colleges of education. There has been an almost direct relationship between declining enrollment and the accompanying loss of student credit hours in the field of education and budget reduction for schools and colleges of education. Such reductions occurred throughout the 1970's and have continued in most states even to this very day. But, while job markets and enrollment declines created difficulties for education programs during the 70's, the world-wide economic transformation and recession of the late 70's and early 80's led to intense financial problems for all of higher education, especially for schools and colleges of education. The impact often had a stunning effect.

The theme of the teacher education literature of the 80's has been on "downsizing", "coping with decline", and "doing more with less". Some feel the very future of teacher education is being threatened; that there is increasing pressure to do a

better, more effective job while experiencing constantly diminishing resources. Unfortunately, schools and colleges of education have not dealt with their financial problems particularly well. Many, hoping the problems would simply go away, have done little careful planning for retrenchment.

In the early 1970's, this rather cavalier attitude was identified in a national survey of higher education. The survey discovered five main responses to budget reductions--all reflected a certain institional naivete; none, of course, were effective:

* Postponing
* Belt tightening
* Cutting and reallocating
* Scrambling for funds
* Planning and worrying

None of these "techniques" were particularly scientific; all reflected the absence of careful planning.

In 1974, another survey found evidence that higher education had begun employing a more systematic response to financial problems. Four basic strategies were identified for confronting financial problems:

* Adjusting budgeting standards (e.g., raising student/faculty ratios)
* Proportioning budget cuts to all units and programs
* Identifying revenue and expenditure control to make each unit responsible for operating within its own resources
* Differentiating budget cuts according to selective priorities

While some easing of the national economic recession is slowly occurring and education is emerging as a major political issue of the Presidential election

of 1984, many schools and colleges of education continue to experience budget difficulties. In a recent study of budget reductions and academic downsizing in a sample of university colleges of education, of those reporting, only 13 institutions were found to be "enhancing" their programs, 33 felt they were "treading or holding their own", while 31 were experiencing "eroding", and 9 were being "downsized".

After more than a decade of downsizing, current strategies for managing decline reflect far more sophistication. Today, there seems to be five basic responses to declining resources in teacher education:

1. Reducing the proliferation of courses and program requirements
2. Administrative reorganization--both within schools of education and within colleges and universities
3. Faculty redevelopment for changed work assignment
4. Collaboration with other units and other institutions
5. Program reduction or discontinuation

Such conceptual listing of techniques in the management of decline fails to reflect the intense political struggles and often vicious in-fighting that is occurring in certain parts of the country. Many schools and colleges have had to fight for their very survival--and some have lost. Others, in a wild scramble for security have utilized all of the above techniques plus a number of rather unique variations. It is interesting to note that while "collaboration" with other institutions was mentioned as a "current agenda", no mention of "merger" occurred.

The Chronicle of Higher Education recently reported that a number of schools and colleges of education have experienced dramatic decisions relative to their future. The University of Michigan's School of Education, one of the historically

great education programs, will have its budget reduced over 40 percent during the next four years--resulting in faculty termination, program elimination, and administrative reorganization. The University of California at Berkeley has been completely reorganized and their programs rearranged. A few schools of education around the country have completely discontinued their teacher education programs. This has occurred at such prestigious institutions as Duke and Case Western Reserve.

And, of course, the Chronicle also reported the merger of the OSU-WOSC School of Education.

MERGER OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

As financial and political situations have deteriorated in some areas of the country, the concept of "institutional merger" has become increasingly studied as a possible approach to institutional survival. And, when it has been employed, it has inevitably involved complex approaches and long-range "strategic" planning. Such mergers have been a sign of conscious recognition that problems will not simply "go away"; that if Schools of Education are to survive, and indeed survive without being emasculated, there must be decidedly new concepts developed for organizational renewal. Merger represents an effort to develop elaborate new institutional "architecture" for comprehensive organizational redesign of Schools of Education. Mergers represent a massive effort to put institutions' "houses in order" and regain control of their destinies.

While the concept of merger used in Oregon was relatively distinct, it was not unique. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reports that the concept of merger has been used before. As far back as 1970, the University of Maine in Portland merged with Gorham State College to form the University of Portland-Gorham (sometimes referred to negatively as Pogo University). Education, along with the other professional schools in business, nursing, and law had all faculties consolidated on one or the other of the two campuses, and buses began running between the two campuses located ten miles apart. Ten years and $1 million later in transportation cost alone, both faculty and students still resist the merger and express a sense of "mild schizophrenia" at the two-campus school. In 1980, AACTE reported that the University of Maine formed a University College of Education consisting of all teacher education programs in the University of Maine system.

Indiana University, recognized as one of the nation's largest and best Schools of Education, was also involved in an institutional merger in 1974. Confronted with both declining enrollment and budget reductions and a desire to bind the "parent campus in Bloomington closer to its (urban) programs in Indianapolis", the Board of Trustees of Indiana University took formal action to unite the Indiana University School of Education in Bloomington with the Division of Education of the Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis campus (IUPUI) into a single "Core Campus School of Education. This marriage brought together a major research and development program and an urban campus, 50 miles apart. During the decade since the merger, there have been both problems and advantages reported. The problems have been relatively severe:

1. A certain loss of identity and autonomy for the Indianapolis campus has occurred.

2. A feeling has persisted among the Bloomington-based faculty that the merger is a "nuisance--an inconvenience, which drains important resources away from their campus".

3. Administrative bureaucracy has increased markedly with the merger and is more complicated and convoluted.

4. Operating across a distance of 50 miles puts considerable strain on the administration and faculty governance structure--even though various types of communication technology have been used.

The advantages of the merger have, however, been viewed as sufficient to justify the merger:

1. The merger has greatly facilitated the ability of students to move from one campus to another without penalty.

2. Students have also benefited by having a "cross-listed" course schedule, single registration procedures, and residency requirements that can be fulfilled on either campus.

3. The merger has made it possible to share resources across the two sites.

4. The merger has reduced the dangerously imbalanced dependency of the Indianapolis campus on part-time faculty members.

5. The merger has eliminated unhealthy competition for students and credit hours between the two campuses and enabled cooperative planning for the two sites.

6. By merging with Indianapolis University, the quality, credibility, and prestige of the Indianapolis campus was improved.

The merger has also permitted better utilization of faculty resources during a time when the Bloomington campus was declining in enrollment and the Indianapolis campus was experiencing mild increases. This prevented the termination of Bloomington-based faculty at a time when the Indianapolis campus would be employing new faculty.

OSU-WOSC SCHOOL OF EDUCATION MERGER

While a number of similarities can be found both in terms of problems and advantages between the Oregon, Maine, and Indiana mergers, the Oregon merger involved some unique situations that could lead to a more successful experience.

1. First of all, the economic situation had deteriorated to the extent that intense political pressure was generated to close one or more Schools of Education in the Oregon System of Higher Education. Of all the states in the nation, few were harder hit than Oregon by the recent national recession. During the late 70's and early 80's, unemployment soared, tax revenues plummeted, and state budgets were slashed. During the spring of 1982, it took the Oregon State Legislature three special sessions to balance their budget--and each special session brought budget cuts to higher education. As the economy worsened at the turn of the decade, there was increased political pressure to eliminate or reduce duplication in the Oregon System of Higher Education. There were editorials, proposals, recommendations from state agencies, and even legislation was introduced to close one or more college campuses, or at the very least, to close one or more schools of education in the state--the one program duplicated on every state system campus.

   Much of this pressure was focused on the two institutions in the state only 20 miles apart who both had large education programs: OSU and WOSC. During a three-year period, there were a number of proposals drafted to close Western Oregon State College; even one recommendation in the Legislature to transform the campus into a low-security state prison. There were also repeated calls for either closing the OSU School of Education or for

eliminating some of the School's programs--especially Elementary Education.

Surrounded by on-going external threats and living in such a besieged situation created an atmosphere conducive to an inter-institutional merger. Even those who were apprehensive about a merger concluded that it was "probably better than the other alternative".

2. The budget cuts to the education programs at OSU and WOSC had diminished program quality and left both campuses riddled with vacancies in essential instructional areas. It also led to program review, reductions, and eliminations. Prior to the merger, the OSU School of Education budget was reduced approximately 7.5 percent ($145,000). In order to make this base budget reduction, eight teacher certification programs were eliminated (all were available at WOSC), three programs were reduced, six faculty members were terminated, and ten early retirements were negotiated over a five-year period. The WOSC education programs experienced a similar cut ($141,000) which led to the reduction of several programs and the loss of four faculty positions. These cuts left both campuses without an adequate faculty necessary to maintain high quality programs. The merger brought together a sufficient critical mass of human and fiscal resources from the two programs to insure high quality merged programs. From the first moment of the merger, faculty from both campuses were utilized to teach on the opposite campuses--filling essential vacancies.

3. The merger was generally supported as an essential development by all key officials: from the Chancellor of Higher Education, to the President of OSU, to the faculty and most of the administration in the two education programs. At the time of merger, WOSC was without a President, and this

vacancy led to anxiety on the WOSC campus. But, by and large, the merger was not a "shotgun" marriage. To a very real degree, the two faculties seemed to have felt it was their only hope of political and financial stability.

4. In a very real sense, the merger was a marriage of equals. While many at WOSC feared being "swallowed up" by the large Pac 10 University, the education programs were relatively evenly matched, both in size and recognition. OSU had the doctoral programs and the state's only Vocational Education program, but WOSC had national recognition for its Special Education Program. OSU had no Special Education program or Department. The WOSC Elementary Education Program had received national recognition by being cited for distinction by AACTE for excellence in teacher education.

5. The merger also involved a third party negotiated agreement with a major research and development center, the Teaching Research Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. This relationship with Teaching Research provides both education faculties with new expertise and support in a way neither had experienced before. The agreement provided for joint faculty and administrative appointments, assistantships for graduate students, a program of faculty development, a combined effort at external funding, and unusually strong expertise in testing, evaluation, and research.

The OSU-WOSC School of Education has now been merged for a year and a half. And, while merger activities will certainly continue for several years, it is possible to gain an insight into the progress to date. The merger has not been without problems:

1. First of all, the merger has consumed the energy and creativity of the faculty and administration for over a year, energy that could have been invested in program development. Some have surely felt that the merger has seemed like an administrative "black hole", consuming the good will of the faculty and administrators in continuous meetings, negotiations, and conflict resolutions.

2. The merger has created a situation of at least temporary administrative confusion. Having a Dean and Assistant Deans scheduled on two campuses has created initial problems and unfortunate delays. It has also necessitated an on-going need to redefine roles and job assignments even while these new roles and positions were being implemented. Many new administrative procedures had to be developed and fine tuned over time. The responsibility of reporting to two Presidents has placed an unusual and complicated set of responsibilities on the Dean of the merged School. The simple fact of participating in Presidential and other administrative meetings on both campuses is, in itself, an unavoidable duplication of time and effort.

3. The merger has led to some increased bureaucratic complexities. Often the Dean, Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs must participate in dual meetings, dual committees, and prepare dual reports for the two campuses. Some issues can only be decided after review by appropriate offices or committees on both campuses and, if disagreements emerge, negotiations are necessary, sometimes at the Presidential level.

4. Scheduling meetings has proven cumbersome and difficult. Efforts are made to alternate all committee meetings between the two campuses, and to schedule School-wide faculty meetings at a "neutral site" midway between the two campuses.

5. It is probably safe to say that there is mutual suspicion by the two campus groups. WOSC fears eventual "take over" by the larger University; OSU fears that the merger will lead to mediocrity on both campuses.

   During the first year and a half, suspicion has led to a "legion" of small problems: inability to agree on stationery letterhead, failure to always contact appropriate offices on both campuses, oversights in copying all appropriate people with various memoranda, arriving late for meetings on the opposite campus, various offices forgetting on occasion that there is a merged School, . . . etc. There are some who fear there is a "hidden agenda" in the merger--that the merger is only phase one in some "unsavory future development".

6. Because the merged School has two budgets, and faculty members are tenured to a specific campus, there has been difficulty in sorting out instructional loads and student credit hours generated on the two campuses. By and large, student credit hours have reverted to the institution where the faculty member is budgeted, but this is often far more difficult than it sounds. In fact, relatively complicated formuli and procedures have been developed to help "sort out" budgetary contributions and student credit hour allocation.

7. For faculty members and Department Chairs, the problems of having to deal with two institutions and the accompanying dual set of offices (Registrars offices, Admissions offices, Financial Aid offices, Graduate offices), often with very different procedures, has been frustrating, if not maddening. Some faculty members have experienced difficulties and anxieties in suddenly finding themselves teaching and working in a new and unfamiliar campus setting.

After a year and a half of merger efforts, the base line question is, of course, was it worth it. The answer seems to be a rather qualified affirmative response.

1. Perhaps most important of all, given the political and economic situation in the state, the merger has given the faculty a sense of stability and control. Far from worrying about closure, the School of Education has become the "proud creation" of the Legislature, the Chancellor, and the State Board of Higher Education. The merger has come to symbolize in the state the type of tough management decisions that lead simultaneously to cost savings and program improvement.

2. Of equal importance is the revitalization of the two faculties. Given the enrollment declines that have occurred for the past decade, all School of Education faculties have grown more mature year by year, with few new positions and the accompanying vitality of new Assistant Professors. The merger brought new personalities, new ideas, and different philosophies together, all creating new social dynamics. The effect has been remarkable in infusing the new School with energy and vitality . . . not to mention a healthy competition in some Departments.

3. For some, the most important achievement of the merger is the financial savings. The most obvious savings was the quarter of a million dollar base budget reduction in Education on the two campuses. In addition, there have been a variety of savings resulting from simple economy of size. Utilization of faculty across the two sites has also helped to eliminate the need for some new faculty positions. There have also been savings by merging offices on the two campuses into single offices with responsibility for both sites.

4. Related directly to the above, is improved management and coordination. Schedules of classes are now coordinated across the two campuses and also for off campus courses. Faculty utilization has also improved with merged administration. Perhaps the most successful aspect of the merger is in the area of coordination. Student teaching assignments and supervision are coordinated for both campuses by a single office. The same is true of career and job placement services. With the Dean, Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs having responsibilities for both campuses, almost all administrative and management decisions occur in a more uniform and coordinated manner.

5. There is general agreement that program quality has improved, and the potential for even greater program quality also exists. New faculty colleagues, new programs, new ideas, even conflicts and differences over ideas and philosophies, have been viewed, by and large, as positive indicators of program vitality. The addition of new programs and new Departments, previously exclusive to only one campus, have provided for exciting new programmatic contributions. Such groups as Special Education, Adult Education, Community College Education, and Vocational Education, are working together for the first time at OSU and WOSC and have come together with a variety of new program concepts, funding possibilities, and intellectual stimulation. The merger has also expanded the OSU doctoral program to the WOSC faculty and students. For the first time in the history of the institution, WOSC faculty are involved in doctoral-level committees, research, and courses.

6. The merger has provided expanded opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students. Students now may choose between two very different campuses, but have access to all programs in the merged School. Through

careful assessment, students needs are anticipated, and courses are scheduled where there are student needs. Wherever possible, faculty move between campuses rather than students. Yet, some students do take courses on the opposite campus, and some programs schedule their classes so that students must take some courses on the opposite campus.

The merger provides students with the largest selection of programs in the state and expands the range of opportunities in terms of courses, electives, majors, minors, and even the choices involving faculty members.

MERGERS IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

At a recent national meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Betty Wishard of Betty Wishard and Associates Inc., a private consulting firm, reported on a national study of mergers in business and industry. Her study focused on financial institutions and involved a national survey followed up by personal interviews with about 2,000 people who had been involved in mergers. And, while seven of ten mergers in heavy industry have failed, deregulation in the banking area has led to more than 2,000 mergers of financial institutions since 1981.

Based on national survey and follow-up interviews, a better insight into mergers can be obtained:

1. Most mergers fail because of human issues rather than financial or legal problems.
2. Mergers have a very negative impact on people involved in them:
   a. Individuals experience extreme stress and often a sense of personal loss;
   b. Between 8 and 30% of employees lose their jobs during mergers; and
   c. Mergers are accompanied by a variety of stress-related illnesses.
3. Mergers are characterized by organizational confusion.
4. A merger is a process that has at least three distinct phases:
   a. Announcement Phase: characterized by shock, trauma, suspicion, personal unrest.
   b. Transition Phase: characterized by a search for a new institutional mission; a time of taking stock and concern for consequences.

c. Integration Phase: characterized by team building and collaboration.

While there are rather distinct differences between mergers in business and industry and those in higher education, there appears to be a number of interesting similarities, especially with mergers of financial institutions. Both higher education and banking institutions have traditionally offered people very secure employment. And, until recently, organizational change was slow in both areas. That has all changed recently. With deregulation in the banking area and the enrollment drops in higher education, both areas have experienced profound changes. Banking institutions are suddenly being forced to compete with a wide variety of new "financial institutions" including Sears Department Store and new techniques including "electronic bank by phone" that has plunged them into intense competition and the associated need for bold, creative leadership. Higher education institutions have likewise been forced into even more competition for fewer potential students. Job security, individual tenure, has become increasingly vulnerable in both banking and higher education. For these reasons, the research in mergers in financial institutions has some very direct parallels in the mergers in higher education in Maine, Indiana, and Oregon.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In the few selected settings where significant programmatic and administrative mergers have been attempted in higher education, there is considerable evidence that they have led to greater institutional security, improved programs, and expanded opportunities for students. The cost in human and administrative energy has been high, especially during the early years. It is also fair to say that the technical and psychological impact of a merger continues for many years, and some problems may well never be resolved.

2. Mergers have emerged as a viable alternative only in rather unusual -- some would say, "desperate" -- situations of institutional transition involving budget reduction or enrollment decline. Because of human disruptions and organizational problems associated with mergers, they should only be considered as a positive possible approach to problems in rather extreme situations. Mergers may in fact only be possible when the alternative is widespread loss of jobs, program elimination, and institutional closure.

3. While institutional mergers may be viable only in rather unusual situations, there may be a number of variations on mergers that offer more widespread utility. Rather than complete mergers, separate institutions could well develop very detailed "cooperative agreements". Such agreements have occurred rather frequently during recent years, as many of the nation's small public and private teacher colleges have experienced declining enrollment. Many of these reductions have demanded cooperative agreements with larger colleges and universities. Cooperative agreements seem to

reflect the most positive aspects of institutional mergers and avail the more difficult aspects.

4. Successful mergers must address the personal stress, suspicion, and upheaval of people in the affected insitution. This demands a broad base of faculty information and involvement. Often, when faculty ask for involvement, they are actually seeking information. This could well take the form of faculty advisory committees, transition teams, and public hearings.

5. Mergers can provide institutional stability, cost savings, and program improvement, but it does so only at a high price in temporary institutional confusion and incredibly numerous demands.

6. Mergers have demonstrated in higher education that they offer increasing job security for faculty members. In a sense, faculty members are trading "campus" time for greater security in a merged setting.

7. Like business and industry, higher education mergers seem to go through rather definite phases, with each phase having its unique set of problems. Mergers are time consuming and merger activities will likewise last for many years.

8. Mergers provide an institutional vehicle to conduct comprehensive, long-range planning and development. Mergers cannot be utilized as a temporary stop gap measure. They demand serious attention to institutional problems and necessitate planning. They also demand faculty involvement.

9. Mergers may, however, provide a reform concept that is one of the most comprehensive, far-reaching approaches to institutional problems that is available. A merger involves everything from program reviews, long-range

strategic planning, faculty revitalization and retraining, and program enhancement.

Only time will tell if the contributions obtained from institutional mergers are worth the energy and effort necessary to effect them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gail S. Chambers, "Negotiating Mergers Between Institutions", in Challenges of Retrenchment, James R. Mingle and Associates, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1981, p. 94-97.

2. George Denemark, "Coping with Declining Resources in Teacher Education: What Deans Can Do", Journal of Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, May - June, 1983, p. 37.

3. Earl Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education, New York: Carnegie Commission, 1971.

4. F. E. Balderston, Managing Today's University, Jossey-Bass, 1974.

5. William G. Monahan, George Denemark, Robert Egbert, Frederick Giles, and Donald McCarty, "Fiscal Conditions in Selected Schools and Colleges of Education in Comprehensive Universities", 1982-1983, AACTE. Unpublished report.

6. The Chronicle of Higher Education, September 7, 1983, p. 1.

7. Maine Times, September 10, 1982, p. 1-2.

8. Hugh Wolf, "The Indiana University School of Education Merger", unpublished paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators national meeting, New Orleans, January 1984.

9. Betty Wishard, "Mergers for Business and Industry", presentation at Association of Teacher Educators national meeting, New Orleans, January 1984.